



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,890	02/04/2005	Claudio Allegretti	163-608	1367
47888	7590	11/03/2006	EXAMINER	
HEDMAN & COSTIGAN P.C. 1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036			ELCENKO, ERIC J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/523,890	ALLEGRETTI, CLAUDIO
	Examiner Eric Elcenko	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,954,454) in view of Wiedman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,463)

Regarding claim 1, Schuster discloses a telecommunications and telephony network (AT) for controlling mobile (TC) or fixed peripheral devices at a customer premises, of the type comprising

at least of local area network (i.e. IP voice network) (col. 7 lines 30-40);

at least one local residents' network (i.e. cable network) (col. 7 lines 30-40)

at least one national network (i.e. wireless network) (col. 7 lines 30-40) and a central network (i.e. enterprise network) (col. 7 lines 30-40)

said telecommunications and telephony network (AT) being provided for delivering signals and data between a plurality of local access (AL, ALI) (each CO logically connected to all other COs within the same local access or transport are) (col. 5 lines 45-55), including local users (UL) (the MDF is directly connected to the CO, and several types of circuits are connected to the MDF (when a line become active a

customer is immediately known) (col. 5 lines 10-30), and a plurality of network accesses (AG) (the broadband service lines may be connected to the IP telephony system through one or more splitters, which are used to route incoming telephony frequencies to the CO switch) (col. 5 lines 58-67), through local exchanges (voice calls or video signals may be routed to the ITG for conversion into RTP IP packets) (co1.8 lines 58-67)

each of said local exchanges (CL,CR) including a multi-protocol gateway device (GV) for video and audio signals and data compression and conversion into IP packets bearing IP telephony data flow or data flow from the internet (the trunks are shared network facilities that are used to interconnect COs and a CO may be an internet service provider, voice calls or video signals may be routed to the ITG for conversion into RTP IP packets) (co1.8 lines 58-67, col. 7 lines 44-55, and col.9 lines 34-51)

wherein said local users (UL) of each local access (AL, ALI) are connected to local centralizing devices (MD) (i.e. DSLAM) (col. 4 lines (53-63) through first linking means (CO) for flowing data and signals (the DSLAM is connected to the splitters which are connected to the MDF, which is directly connected to the CO) (col. 7 lines 64-67, col. 5 lines 12-20 and figure2) and

said local centralizing devices (MD) are in turn connected to said local exchanges (CL,CR) through second linking means (C1,C4) for flowing data and signals (the DSLAM is connected to the IP router (after passing through the splitter the calls are then digitized by the DSLAM and sent to the IP router) which is connected to the ITG (IP voice packets may be sent by the IP router to the ITG)) (col. 9 lines 34-50 and 8-16),

while said local exchanges (CL,CR) are connected to said networks accesses (AG) through third linking means (C2,C41) for flowing data and signals (the DSLAM is connected to the IP router (after passing through the splitter the calls are then digitized by the DSLAM and sent to the IP router) which is connected to the ITG (IP voice packets may be sent by the IP router to the ITG)) (col.9 lines :34-50 and 8-16),

Schuster fails to disclose characterized in that at least said second (C1 ,C4) and said third linking means (C2,C41) are constituted by directional satellite radio bridges (RLD,ST),

In a similar field of endeavor, Wiedeman discloses characterized in that at least said second (C1,C4) and said third linking means (C2,C41) are constituted by directional satellite radio bridges (RLD,ST) (a gateway which interconnects the UT to the PSTN via one or more of the satellites through bidirectional satellite RF links) (col. 4 lines 30-40),

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to modify the invention of Schuster to include characterized in that at least said second (C1,C4) and said third linking means (C2,C41) are constituted by directional satellite radio bridges (RLD,ST). Motivation for this modification would have been to all the users terminal access to the PSTN.

Regarding claim 2, the combination discloses a telecommunications and telephony network (AT) as claimed in claim 1. Schuster further discloses characterized in that said first linking means (CO) are constituted physical cables such as telephone twisted pairs or optical fibers (the physical media includes media for one or more

IP/data networks such as copper wire pairs for DSL and media for POTS such as copper wire) (col. 4 lines 22-30).

Regarding claim 3, the combination discloses a telecommunications and telephony network (AT) as claimed in claim 1. Wiedeman further discloses characterized in that said local routing devices (R) are connected to satellite routing devices (RS) or to radio bridges (PR) (a gateway which interconnects the UT to the PSTN via one or more satellites (satellites may be may be bent pipe repeaters) through bidirectional links) (col. 4 lines 25-45), said radio bridges (PR) being able to provide connections between local residents' networks (RLC) a gateway which interconnects the UT to the PSTN via one or more satellites (satellites may be may be bent pipe repeaters) through bidirectional links) (col. 4 lines 25-45).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to modify the invention of the combination to include characterized in that said local routing devices (R) are connected to satellite routing devices (RS) or to radio bridges (PR), said radio bridges (PR) being able to provide connections between local residents' networks (RLC). Motivation for this modification would have been to all the users terminal access to the PSTN.

3. Claim 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster et al. (Schuster), U.S. Patent 6,954,454, in view of Wiedeman et al (Wiedeman), U.S. Patent 6,233,463, in further view of Bosch et al. (Bosch), U.S. Patent 5,839,053. Regarding claim 4, the combination Schuster and Wiedeman discloses telecommunications and telephony network (AT) as claimed in claim 1. Wiedeman

further discloses characterized in that each national network is connected to the relative region network by means of satellite network (a gateway which interconnects the UT to the PSTN via one or more satellites (satellites may be may be bent pipe repeaters) through bidirectional links) (col. 4 lines 25-45).

Wiedeman fails to disclose using a geostationary satellite.

In a similar field of endeavor, Bosch discloses using a geostationary satellite (GEO) for communication purposes (the station ST is connected via GEO communication satellites) (col. 6 lines 46-56).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to modify the invention of the combination Schuster and Wiedeman to include using a geostationary satellite (GEO) for communication purposes. Motivation for this modification would have been to form a spatial diversity communication system.

Regarding claim 5, the combination Schuster and Wiedeman discloses telecommunications and telephony network (AT) as claimed in claim 1. Wiedeman further discloses characterized in that each regional network is connected to the relative local residents' network (RLC) by means of a digital bidirectional satellite radio transmission (a gateway which interconnects the UT to the PSTN via one or more satellites (satellites may be may be bent pipe repeaters) through bidirectional links) (col. 4 lines 25-45) or by means of communication via optical fibres.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to modify the invention of the combination Schuster and Wiedeman to include discloses characterized in that each regional network is connected to the relative local residents' network (RLC) by means of

a digital bidirectional satellite radio transmission or by means of communication via optical fibres. Motivation for this modification would have been to all the users terminal access to the PSTN.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11 August 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues the examiner does not provide enough motivation and that the two references used would not have sufficient motivation to be combined. In regards to Claims 1-5, the examiner fully believe all aspects of the claimed subject matter has been taught of suggested by the referenced material, alone or in combination. Applicant argues the two fields of subject matter are not applicable to each other for combination. Examiner disagrees with this assertion. Each reference deals with communication. Communication systems and networks are becoming more and more intertwined and older and newer systems are being brought together. Satellite technology is not uncommon when also dealing with IP networks. It is commonplace for these two references to have their subject matter combined for a newer better network or device. The field of endeavor is indeed the same being communication or movement of data in a network.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Elcenko whose telephone number is (571) 272-8066. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM through 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ee



DUC M. NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600